

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION AT COLUMBUS**

RANDALL TYLER HUTCHISON,	:	Case No. 2:25-cv-543
	:	
Petitioner,	:	
	:	
vs.	:	District Judge Michael H. Watson
	:	Magistrate Judge Chelsey M. Vascura
	:	
WARDEN, CORRECTIONAL RECEPTION CENTER,	:	
	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

---

---

**ORDER AND REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

---

---

On May 15, 2025, this action was docketed in this Court. (Doc. 1).

It appears that the Petition in this case was filed in response to a Deficiency Order issued in Case No. 2:25-cv-281, which directed Petitioner to file an amended habeas corpus Petition that complies with the federal rules governing 28 U.S.C. § 2254 cases. (*See* Case No. 2:25-cv-281 (Doc. 5-1, at PageID 28)). Petitioner submitted a new Petition but omitted the case number, and his submission resulted in the opening of this action.

The Court understands the filing in this case to be intended for Case No. 2:25-cv-281. It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Petition (Doc. 1) filed in this case, No. 2:25-cv-543, be docketed as an Amended Petition in *Hutchison v. Warden*, Case No. 2:25-cv-281 (S.D. Ohio). Further, because this case is duplicative of Case No. 2:25-cv-281, this action should be **DISMISSED**. *See, e.g., Baldwin v. Marshall & Ilsley Fin. Corp.*, No. 1:11cv804, 2011 WL 7499434, at \*4 (S.D. Ohio Nov. 23, 2011) (Litkovitz, M.J.) (and numerous cases cited therein), *adopted*, 2012 WL 869289 (S.D. Ohio Mar. 14, 2012) (Weber, J.) (noting the Court's inherent power to dismiss an action when it is duplicative of another action pending in the federal court).

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:**

The Petition (Doc. 1) filed in this case, No. 2:25-cv-543, be docketed in *Hutchison v. Warden*, Case No. 2:25-cv-281 (S.D. Ohio).

**IT IS THEREFORE RECOMMENDED THAT:**

This duplicative case be **DISMISSED**, and the pending Notice of Deficiency in this case (Doc. 2) be **VACATED as moot**.

**PROCEDURE ON OBJECTIONS:**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), **WITHIN 14 DAYS** after being served with a copy of the recommended disposition, a party may serve and file specific written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations. This period may be extended further by the Court on timely motion for an extension. Such objections shall specify the portions of the Report objected to and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. If the Report and Recommendation is based in whole or in part upon matters occurring on the record at an oral hearing, the objecting party shall promptly arrange for the transcription of the record, or such portions of it as all parties may agree upon, or the Magistrate Judge deems sufficient, unless the assigned District Judge otherwise directs. A party may respond to another party's objections **WITHIN 14 DAYS** after being served with a copy thereof. Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).

May 16, 2025

Chelsey M. Vascura  
CHELSEY M. VASCURA  
United States Magistrate Judge